UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,426	07/06/2006	Mohamed Abdulkader Ibrahim	EX04-019C-US	6671

63572 7590 05/12/2009

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT @ BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3100
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
MCDOWELL, BRIAN E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/552,426	IBRAHIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN MCDOWELL	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *9-18,30 and 31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *10-18* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *30* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *9 and 31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

/BEM/

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Status of Claims

Claims 9-18, 30, and 31 are pending in the instant application. Claims 10-18 are withdrawn from consideration.

Status of Claim Objections

Applicant's amendment of claims 9 and 30, see Remarks, filed 4/14/2009, with respect to the objections set forth in the Non-Final Office Action mailed 3/17/2009, has been fully considered and the objection has been overcome.

Status of Rejections

35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

Applicant's amendment of claim 9, see Remarks, filed 4/14/2009, with respect to the rejection set forth in the Non-Final Office Action mailed 3/17/2009, has been fully considered and the rejection has been overcome.

35 USC § 112 (1st Paragraph)

Applicant's cancellation of claim 32, see Remarks, filed 4/14/2009, with respect to the rejection set forth in the Non-Final Office Action mailed 3/17/2009, has been fully considered and the rejection has been overcome.

New Objections and Rejections

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an Abstract of the Disclosure.

In chemical patent abstracts for compounds or compositions, the general nature of the compound or composition should be given as well as its use, *e.g.*, "The compounds are of the class of alkyl benzene sulfonyl ureas, useful as oral anti-diabetics." Exemplification of a species could be illustrative of members of the class. For processes, the type reaction, reagents and process conditions should be stated, generally illustrated by a single example unless variations are necessary.

It is recommended that the structure of Formula IV be inserted into the abstract to cure the deficiency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9 and 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitations "optionally two of R^2 together are oxo", "two of $R^{2"}$, "one of $R^{2"}$, etc. in formula IV. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since there is only one R^2 present in said formula. Claim 9 recites the limitation "n is zero to five". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since n can only be 0-4 on the pyridine ring. Claim 9 recites the limitation "m is zero to four". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner does not currently see any variable "m" in formula IV. Claim 31 is rejected

because it depends from rejected claim 9 and fails to remedy the deficiencies of the claim from which it depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (1st Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds and/or compositions where $R^1 = R^2 = X = H$, optionally substituted lower alkyl, and halo, $R^3 = H$ and optionally substituted lower alkyl, $R^4 = H$, halo, optionally substituted lower alkyl, and $-OR^6$ (wherein $R^6 =$ optionally substituted lower alkyl), and $R^5 = H$ and $-OR^6$ (wherein $R^6 =$ optionally substituted lower alkyl, does not reasonably provide enablement for the other thousands of compounds that applicant is claiming. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required:

(A) The breadth of the claims;
(B) The nature of the invention;
(C) The state of the prior art;

(D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
(E) The level of predictability in the art;
(F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
(G) The existence of working examples; and
(H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444. Analysis is described below:

(A) Breadth of claims: The formula IV is drawn to a myriad of substituents that vary independently and lead to compounds of a wide variety of structures. These compounds encompass molecules that widely vary in the physical and chemical properties such as size, molecular weight, acidity, basicity, and properties that are known in the art to greatly influence pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters, not to mention the ability to productively bind to claimed biological target molecules. The claims cover compounds easily in the millions given the number of possible rings, ring systems covered by the claims' scope along with varying choices for remaining variables; thus the claims are very broad.

(B) The nature of the invention: 4-amino substituted quinazolines for the treatment of abnormal cell proliferation through inhibition of TIE-2.

(C) State of the Prior Art: Chemistry is unpredictable. See In Re Marzocchi and Horton 169 USPQ at 367 paragraph 3:

"Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they were to learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why.

Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor-intensive but otherwise undemanding task.

In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such work .....Chemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too copious)" Dorwald F. A. Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis, 2005, Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface.

(D) Skill of those in the art: The level of skill in the art is high.

(E) Level of predictability in the art: It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(F) Direction or Guidance: Little guidance or direction is provided by applicant in reference to making compounds other than those with the variables previously mentioned. The presence of various bulky heterocyclic or carbocyclic rings attached to the compound's core may be chemically incompatible with the method of use embraced in the instant claims. Specification offers no teachings or suggestion as to how to make and use these compounds. Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims

nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.";

(G) Working Examples: The compound core depicted with specific substituents represent a narrow subgenus for which applicant has provided sufficient guidance to make and use; however, this disclosure is not sufficient to allow extrapolation of the limited examples to enable the scope of the compounds instantly claimed. Applicant has provided no working examples of any compounds where the compound of formula IV did not contain the variables previously mentioned above in the present application.

The specification gives some *in vitro* test results on TIE-2 inhibitory effects of a limited number of preferable compounds, however it is too homogeneous to provide a clear evaluation of which moieties attached to the compound's core out of the many claimed might affect potency to a large or small degree. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable and target compounds need to be individually assessed for viability. Extremely broad generalizations as found in the instant claims are in contradiction with the basis of quantitative structure-activity-relationship (QSAR).

Within the specification, "specific operative embodiments or examples of the invention must be set forth. Examples and description should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claims. *Markush* claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the *Markush* group. Where the constitution and formula of a chemical compound is stated only as a probability or speculation, the disclosure is not sufficient to support claims identifying the compound by such composition or formula." See MPEP 608.01(p).

(H) The quantity of experimentation needed: Since there are very limited working examples as described above, the amount of experimentation is expected to be high and burdensome. Applicant fails to provide guidance and supporting information for how to make and/or use the thousands of other compounds which are encompassed by the claims, therefore undue experimentation would be expected.

Due to the level of unpredictability in the art, the very limited guidance provided, and the lack of working examples, the disclosure is seen to lack enablement. MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Conclusion

Claims 9 and 31 are rejected. Claim 30 is allowable.

Reasons for Allowance

Claim 30 embrace species that contain novel carbocyclic or heterocyclic fused and non-fused ring systems at the 4-amino position of the quinazoline ring.

The limitations listed supra represent the limitations that are not taught or fairly suggested by the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN MCDOWELL whose telephone number is (571)270-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 1624

/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, AU 1624